

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

#### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC USING SINE PAIRS AND TRACEASE Office Address CONMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Rev. 1458 Advancing, Vygana 22013-0490

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMEO INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
10/621,188	07/16/2003	Claus G. Lugmair	99-66CON1	2334
22905	7590 06/06/2004		FXAM	DUFR
SYMYX TECHNOLOGIES INC LEGAL DEPARTMENT 3100 CENTRAL EXPRESS SANTA CLARA, CA 95051		NGUYEN, CAM N		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1754	

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/621,188	LUGMAIR ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cam N Nguyen	1754	
- The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	of the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of the member	FION, CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a find the statutory minimum of this period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI	roply be timely filed rby (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the matting date of this communication.	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	07/46/02 (a anatinustina at an	£10.000	
	This action is non-final.	/516,669).	
3) Since this application is in condition for a	illowance except for formal men		
closed in accordance with the practice un	nder Ex nade Ovavie 1935 C F	ters, prosecution as to the ments is	
Disposition of Claims	parto dadyto; 1000 0.5	7. 11, 403 O.G. 213.	
4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the applic			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	ingrawn from consideration.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction :	and/or election moviroment		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa			
10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2003 Is/are	a) accepted or b) objec	ted to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection t	o the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c 11) The cath or declaration is objected to by the	orrection is required if the drawing (	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
	to Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur		119(a)-(d) or (f).	
Certified copies of the priority docur     Certified copies of the priority docur	ments nave been received.		
Copies of the certified copies of the	none nave been received in Ap	opiication No,	
application from the International Bu	priority documents have been i	received in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	ist of the certified copies not a	and and	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	eceived.	

Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO-ISB/06) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/16/03. U.S. Patent and Tredemark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

Application/Control Number: 10/621,188 Art Unit: 1754

#### DETAILED ACTION

### Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In step(b), "carrier" should be -carriers-.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (Second Paragraph)

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- A. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said liquid medium" in step(c). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- B. Claim 4 recites the limitation "the composition" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See in @ Goodman. 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPO2d 2010 (Fed. Cr. 1993); In re Long, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPO2d 2010 (Fed. Cr. 1993); In re Long, 759 F.2d 887, 226 USPO (24 Cr. 1985); In w Van Omum. 866 F.2d 937, 214 USPO 276 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPO 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 38 USPO 644 (CCPA 1969).

Application/Control Number: 10/621,188 Art Unit: 1754

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3,73(b).

5. Claims 1-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-7, 25-26, 29, 36, & 40-41 of <u>U.S. Patent No. 6,627,571 B1</u> (hereinafter Pat '571). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

It appears that the only difference between the claimed method and the method disclosed in Pat '571 is the limitation "said liquid suspension further including at least one agent to alter its viscosity, surface or wetting characteristics and facilitate handling" (see Pat '571, claim 1, step(a)). It is inherent that instantly claimed method would include this limitation due to the open phrase "comprising" in the instant claim 1.

There is no patentable distinction seen between the claimed method and the method as disclosed in Pat '571.

## Allowable Subject Matter

 Claims 13-19 are not being rejected under the art rejection because they contain allowable subject matter. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a method of forming an array of supported catalyst candicate materials requiring a combination of step(a) thru step(f) as specified in claim 13. There is no motivation to combine the teachings of the references together.

#### Citations

 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. As set forth in the parent application.

#### Conclusion

- Claims 1-19 are originally pending in the application. Claims 1-12 are rejected.

  Claims 13-19 are allowed.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Cam Nguyen, whose telephone number is (671) 272-1357. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:30 am. to 6:00 pm.

The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306,

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to telephone number (571) 272-1700.

Can

Nguyen/cnn (LAA)

Primary Examiner

June 5, 2004

Art Unit: 1754